Accelerating microscopy: incorporating half-lies in imaging protocols

Daniel W. Drumm[1,*] and Andrew D. Greentree[1]

[1] *Australian Research Council Centre of Excellence for Nanoscale BioPhotonics, Physics, School of Science, RMIT University, Melbourne VIC 3000, Australia*

(Dated: April 21, 2017)

Finding a fluorescent target in a biological environment is a common and pressing microscopy problem. This task is formally analogous to the canonical search problem. In ideal (noise-free, truthful) search problems, the well-known binary search is optimal. The case of half-lies, where one of two responses to a search query may be deceptive, introduces a richer, Rényi-Ulam problem and is particularly relevant to practical microscopy. We analyse microscopy in the contexts of Rényi-Ulam games and half-lies, showing the cost of insisting on verification by positive result in search algorithms; for the zero-error case bisectioning incurs a 50% penalty in the average number of queries required. The optimal partitioning of search spaces directly following verification in the presence of random half-lies is determined, and a heuristic trisectioning search algorithm developed, achieving performance close to the estimated theoretical optimum as measured by number of queries.

arXiv:1704.05980v1 [physics.optics] 20 Apr 2017

I. INTRODUCTION

Optical microscopy remains a key platform technology enabling detection, tracking, and sometimes quantification of biologically and medically relevant targets. Standard and advanced microscopy approaches include confocal,[1] and multiphoton[2] techniques, which deliver high-power light to classically small (diffraction-limited) spot volumes, exciting either endogenous targets,[3] or introduced emitters functionalised to bind targets[4,5] within or between cells.

Standard approaches to confocal and multiphoton microscopy involve rastering the focal spot through a sample at constant scan rate; this can be treated as a finite dwell time on each pixel/voxel. Firstly, this is to allow enough time for signal generation, and secondly, the dwell time is usually above a greater threshold value long enough that even dim regions of the sample exhibit low noise. However, biological materials (and some introduced emitters) often exhibit photosensitive or even phototoxic responses[6], and may photobleach over time[5,7,8]. There is therefore a tension between resolving the image and minimally affecting the sample, and consequently a need to use the probe microscope light in the most efficient manner possible, extracting maximal information per photon used in both excitation and collection.

Whether using multiphoton or confocal techniques, a measurement illuminates a continuous sample region and is equivalent to asking a question of presence or absence of some target. However, both confocal and multiphoton microscopes suffer considerable signal photon loss[1], due to their collection angles, detection point-spread functions, and sundry loss pathways. Conversely, due to improvements in detector technology, false photon gain events (*e.g.* dark counts) are now extremely rare. Therefore the physical situation strongly resembles a half-lie scenario, where the presence of a particle may be subject to a lie (*i.e.*, be undetected), but the absence of a particle is correctly reported – albeit by an absence of signal.

Half-lies have been studied in the context of games where a Questioner attempts to guess which integer the Responder has in mind of those in some domain (*e.g.*, $[1,10^6]$). Only queries requiring yes/no answers are allowed; hence the response space is binary, and the category of problem is known as binary search[9,10]. The optimal classical method for the Questioner to accomplish this aim is to consecutively halve that domain; this technique is a special case of the splitting algorithm.[11] For binary searches, $\lceil \log_2(m) \rceil$ queries suffice to locate one of m integers. The game becomes more interesting when the Responder occasionally lies.[12,13] These Rényi-Ulam games have been studied extensively, both mathematically,[14–18] and in various applications.[19–29]

As originally described, the Rényi game is of the form "Find a number $a \in \{1, 2, ..., m\}$" using arbitrary queries with yes/no answers, where the Responder may lie randomly.[12] Ulam's game is similar, but specifies the number of times the Responder may lie. Variants since considered include asymmetric errors (including half-lies), asking only comparison-type questions, *etc.* ([14] gives a comprehensive list). Partially fidelitous solutions have been presented for a subset of these problems,[30] though most studies to date have focussed upon finding optimal strategies where a minimum number of queries suffice in all cases to identify the target with 100% fidelity.[15–17,20,21,24–26,31–40]

An interesting variant of Rényi-Ulam games arises when the lies are limited to only one response type, *e.g.*, "yes", or "present". Such constraints are termed "half-lies",[31] and have again been the subject of some enquiry,[21,36] albeit for specific known numbers of such half-lies, or for unfettered choice of query.[18]

Here, we show the connection between microscopy and Rényi-Ulam games, and explore subtle differences from standard Rényi-Ulam games arising from the physics of confocal and multiphoton apparatus. These differences preclude the usual approach of determining an optimal number of queries, instead forcing us to consider their average number across many trials. We find a useful heuristic for accelerated searching under these conditions, which include the treatment of noise as an intrinsic char-

acteristic of the measurement apparatus, rather than as a background distractor as assumed by signal detection theory[41,42].

This paper is organised as follows: in Sec. II we describe the equivalence between Rényi-Ulam games and microscopy, before developing a mathematical approach to selecting queries in Sec. III and obtaining an information map. We discuss potential uses of the map in various strategies in Sec. IV, analysing their average behaviour across many trials, before concluding with Sec. V.

II. MICROSCOPY AS A RÉNYI-ULAM GAME

We wish to determine one fluorescent target's position x_0 in some continuous 1D domain $x \in [0, L]$ to within some precision ϵ (effectively discretising into $1/\epsilon$ bins), minimising the average number of queries required. The result achieved must be 100% fidelitous. We assume the microscope illuminates and collects from a region defined by a single top-hat function (THF) with arbitrarily controllable boundaries, as this is the simplest approximation we can make. This is equivalent to a query in the Rényi-Ulam game over the THF. Queries provoke n fluorescence signal photons from the target where $n \in \{0, 1\}$. $n = 1$ *iff* the target is in the non-zero region of the THF, otherwise $n = 0$. These queries are formally equivalent to Rényi-Ulam comparison queries, *e.g.*, "Is $b < x_0 < c$?", for some threshold values b and c (see Fig. 1).

Microscopes often exhibit photon loss mechanisms, including finite numerical aperture, attenuation through optical fibres, and detector inefficiencies. Such system-wide losses are usually (multiplicatively) characterised through an overall efficiency, η. This parameter describes the chance of collecting a photon if the target is illuminated by the peak value of the point-spread function, and since photons are usually collected through the same PSF, if collection occurs through the peak value also. Most microscopes have non-flat PSFs, often modelled with Gaussian functions. Thus, the true efficiency is $\eta_0 = \eta \times \mathrm{PSF}^2(x_0)$, if we normalise the peak value to 1. For simplicity, we treat the PSF as a flat top-hat, and hence the true efficiency is simply η (if the target is illuminated). Being concerned primarily with photon loss, we define it as the complement of collection events, $\alpha_0 = 1 - \eta$, regardless of the origin of the loss.

Photon loss thus ocurrs with independent probability $\alpha_0 \in [0, 1]$. This loss is the genesis mechanism of the half-lie. Surviving photons are collected and counted; their number is the reported measurement result $r \in \{0, 1\}$. We formally connect target presence with a Rényi-Ulam "yes", its absence with a "no", and allow half-lies on "yes" states only. *I.e.*, a "yes" could be reported as a "no", but a "no" state can never be reported as a "yes" (see Table I, or Eq. 1). The game is immediately extensible in multiple commuting spatial dimensions; one plays a separable, independent game in each such dimension.

Since we have probabilistic, random photon loss, we explicitly play a Rényi, rather than an Ulam, game. The number of loss events is theoretically unbounded. Therefore, optimal solutions to Ulam games as described above do not exist here, since they describe scenarios where the number of lies (or half-lies) is known *a priori*. Solutions to the Rényi game to date have been similarly focussed on obtaining a specific number of necessary and sufficient queries to locate the target, which is only possible for half-lie rates $\alpha_0 < 1/3$.[43] Since microscopes typically have $\alpha_0 > 1/3$, we instead concern ourselves with min-



FIG. 1. Microscopy as a game: determining a fluorescing target's position (red cross) x_0 on $x \in [0, L]$ within ϵ. Top: microscope (μ-scope) top-hat point-spread function (green-shaded area) not aligned with target ($x_0 < b < c$); no photon generated ($n = 0$); measurement result guaranteed $r = 0$. Bottom: target within microscope PSF ($b < x_0 < c$); photon generated ($n = 1$). Possibility of photon loss α, leading to probabilistic measurement result ($r \in \{0, 1\}$). Here, $c = v$ as discussed in the main text; also v and α are uniquely specified in each measurement. The game ends when the distribution for x is bounded within any distance ϵ not necessarily centred on the true location x_0, which is never found.

Rényi state	Possible responses
No	No
Yes	No or Yes
Microscopy state	**Possible responses**
Absent	$r = 0$
Present	$r \in \{0, 1\}$

TABLE I. Possible responses in Rényi game and microscopy experiment, illustrating the connection between the experiment and the game. Because the "No" and $r = 0$ responses appear for both states, the possibility of a half-lie must be considered when one of these responses is obtained. Conversely, a "Yes" or $r = 1$ response is guaranteed to be fidelitous.

imising the *average* number of queries. Such an approach will aid experiments requiring many replications and/or variations, as are common in biology and medicine.

III. MATHEMATICAL FORMALISM

We now formulate the game, with particular regard for the choice of measurement boundary (defined shortly) and the consequences of that choice for algorithm run time. Random variables X, N, and R, are defined on the domains of x, n, r (position, number of signal photons, measurement result); A is the signal loss probability, on $\alpha \in [0,1]$, and V is the turn-off boundary between the measured and non-measured regions, defined on $v \in [0,1]$. Without loss of generality due to the invariance of Shannon information with a reordering of the distribution, we fix the turn-on boundary at the leftmost point with PDF > 0 for convenience. The physics of our system allows us to put constraints on their behaviour:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}_{N|V,X}(n|v,x) &= \theta(v-x)\,\delta_{n,1} + \theta(x-v)\,\delta_{n,0}, \text{ and}\\ \mathbb{P}_{R|N,A}(r|n,\alpha) &= \delta_{n,0}\delta_{r,0} + \delta_{n,1}\left[\alpha\delta_{r,0} + (1-\alpha)\,\delta_{r,1}\right]\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where θ is the Heaviside step function, and $\delta_{i,j}$ is the Kronecker delta function as the domains n and r, of N and R respectively, are discrete. Since we only probe emitters left of v, we can only excite emissions left of v; the receipt of a photon necessarily requires its emission, and is sometimes blocked by signal loss. For conciseness, we henceforth omit the probabilities' domains.

As the domain v is continuous, we set $\mathbb{P}_V = \delta(v - v_0)$, using the Dirac delta function, and assuming a perfectly known boundary, v_0. Also, $\mathbb{P}_A = \delta(\alpha - \alpha_0)$, a perfectly known false negative rate, α_0. Further, although the target has a unique position x_0, this is unknown; therefore we have a uniform prior over X, such that $\mathbb{P}_X = 1/L$.

Since A and V are uniquely determined,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}_{A|N,V,X} &= \mathbb{P}_A;\\ \mathbb{P}_{V|N,X} &= \mathbb{P}_V.\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Also, } \mathbb{P}_{N,V,X} &= \mathbb{P}_{N|V,X}\mathbb{P}_{V|X}\mathbb{P}_X,\\ &= \mathbb{P}_{N|V,X}\mathbb{P}_V\mathbb{P}_X, \text{and}\\ \mathbb{P}_{N,X} &= \int_V \mathbb{P}_{N|V,X}\mathbb{P}_V\mathbb{P}_X dv.\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

We now consider that when we attempt to detect photons, we are making a quantum measurement of the field. Since the position of the emitter and measurement boundary are determined before the Markov process of measuring (collapsing) the state and reporting the outcome, we can deconditionalise thus:

$$\mathbb{P}_{R|N,A,V,X} = \mathbb{P}_{R|N,A}. \tag{4}$$

We form the full joint by:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}_{N,A,V,X,R} &= \mathbb{P}_{R|N,A,V,X}\mathbb{P}_{N,A,V,X}\\ &= \mathbb{P}_{R|A,V,N,X}\mathbb{P}_{A,V|N,X}\mathbb{P}_{N,X}\\ &= \mathbb{P}_{R|A,V,N,X}\mathbb{P}_{A|V,N,X}\mathbb{P}_{V|N,X}\mathbb{P}_{N,X}\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Substituting Eqs. 1–4 in Eq. 5 and marginalising gives

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}_{X,R} &= \sum_N \int_{A,V} \mathbb{P}_{N,A,V,X,R}\, d\alpha dv\\ &= \frac{1}{L}\left[\delta_{r,0}\theta(x-v_0) + \alpha_0\delta_{r,0}\theta(v_0-x)\right.\\ &\qquad \left. + (1-\alpha_0)\,\delta_{r,1}\theta(v_0-x)\right], \text{ and}\\ \mathbb{P}_R &= \int_X \mathbb{P}_{X,R}\, dx\\ &= \frac{1}{L}\left[\delta_{r,0}(L - v_0 + \alpha_0 v_0) + \delta_{r,1}(1-\alpha_0)\,v_0\right]\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Now, using the definitions of Shannon information:

$$\begin{aligned}H(X) &= -\int_X \mathbb{P}_X \log_e(\mathbb{P}_X)\; dx,\\ \text{and } H(X|R) &= \sum_R \int_X \mathbb{P}_{X,R} \log_e\left(\frac{\mathbb{P}_R}{\mathbb{P}_{X,R}}\right) dx,\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

we can calculate the mutual information:

$$\begin{aligned}I(X:R) &= H(X) - H(X|R)\\ &= \log_e\left(\frac{1}{L}\right) - \frac{1}{L}\left[(1-\alpha_0)\,v_0\log_e(v_0)\right.\\ &\quad + (L - v_0 + \alpha_0 v_0)\log_e(L - v_0 + \alpha_0 v_0)\\ &\quad \left. -\alpha_0 v_0 \log_e(\alpha_0)\right]\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

which we maximise to find the condition:

$$v_0 = \frac{L\alpha_0^{\frac{\alpha_0}{1-\alpha_0}}}{1 + (1-\alpha_0)\,\alpha_0^{\frac{\alpha_0}{1-\alpha_0}}}, \tag{9}$$

which is shown in Fig. 2. As expected, since this limit is formally equivalent to the canonical binary search problem, $\lim_{\alpha_0 \to 0} v_0 = 1/2$ and is undefined for $\alpha_0 = 1$; however, the limiting value as $\alpha_0 \to 1$ is $v_0 \to 1/e$. The optimal binning in the presence of false negative errors is therefore less than $L/2$.

IV. SEARCH STRATEGIES

A. Proposals

A greedy strategy for target searches would be to maximise the information gain for each subsequent measurement. However, any search over a region that is not a simple dividend of the overall region will be difficult



FIG. 2. Optimal binning strategy per independent measurement on $[0, L]$ in the presence of false negative errors: a) false-colour plot of information gained as a function of false negative rate α and region boundary w, with particular values of α marked (black dashed lines), and optimal region boundary placement shown as a function of α (white line); b) focus on optimal boundary placement (white line from a); c)-f) line slices of a) showing the information gain for each boundary placement at $\alpha \in \{0.2, 0.4, 0.6, 0.8\}$ (black lines in a); and g) maximal information possible per measurement shown as a function of α.

to update for a null result, $r = 0$. We therefore consider simple heuristic approaches, whereby changes to the measurement boundary are selected from a short list according to the relative probability density in each. We develop and contrast four such approaches: bi-, tri-, and tetra-sectioning with verification, and the limiting extension of these to sequentially scanning each of the $1/\epsilon$ bins.

The obvious choice for an heuristic is bisectioning, the limiting case for zero error rate. Here, we define an approach where null measurements simply unbalance the PDF, and following measurements are undertaken on the other half; *i.e.*, naïvely rastering between only two equally sized subdomains at a time. This cycle repeats until positive verification of target presence occurs by a measurement $r = 1$; the problem is then recursively reposed within the successful half (Fig. 3, for $q = 2$). We call this process "bisectioning with verification". Note that by insisting on positive verification, we cannot take advantage of all the available information in the low-error limit. On average, this process dictates 1.5 measurements per level of enquiry, due to the equal probabilities of the target being or not being in the first-examined bin; *i.e.*, for precision ϵ, $1.5\lceil \log_2 (1/\epsilon) \rceil$ queries are required.

Here, we define a new heuristic: trisectioning with verification. Three equal subdomains are queried in turn until positive verification is obtained. The average number of measurements required (for error-free search) will be $2\lceil \log_3 (1/\epsilon) \rceil$. Due to our high probability of signal loss, we expect a considerably higher number of measurements than the error-free case. Note that this is explicitly not the ternary search of Rényi-Ulam games, defined as a special case of q-ary search.[34,44] That refers instead to a similar, but subtly different process in which the Responder indicates which of the q bins holds the target. A good example problem of that type is finding a heavier coin by balance weighing.[18] Neither is it the ternary search of computer science or learning, where it is used to maximise unimodal functions by evaluating their value at two intermediate points,[45,46] or to classify and sort data.[47]

We also extend this idea to tetrasectioning, which is analogous to bi- and tri-sectioning but partitions the surviving search space into four equal bins at any level of measurement. Similarly, the average number of measurements for error-free search will be $2.5\lceil \log_4 (1/\epsilon) \rceil$.

The penultimate approach we consider is to use precisely as many equal sections as we require for the desired



FIG. 3. q-sectioning algorithm requiring detection to proceed. Update prior step not formally required. We choose (without loss of generality) to index subdomains from the left boundary. l is an index for the q subdomains required at any step of q-sectioning. The algorithm completes when the final subdomain is smaller than the precision required, ϵ.

precision, *i.e.*, $1/\epsilon$ bins, and to raster over these bins until positive verification is obtained. We call this approach "rastering with verification". On average, this will require $0.5\,(1/\epsilon + 1)\log_{1/\epsilon}(1/\epsilon)$ measurements, which for any appreciable value of $1/\epsilon$ is prohibitively large compared to the previous three strategies. We therefore summarily dismiss rastering with verification as unfeasible (except for small ϵ, where it approaches the other strategies) and do not consider it further in this work.

Finally, we consider rastering as is commonly performed. Here, the domain is continuously scanned from left to right, with the THF having width ϵ. This is used instead of dwelling on each bin in turn to avoid ringdown of the equipment after stopping and any consequent dark time to allow its mitigation. The scan rate is slow for several reasons, including shot noise suppression, and convenience in automation by standardising the process for every pixel. We can, however, model this approach as physically dwelling on each bin in turn for a set number of queries before moving on. For a dwell time corresponding to γ queries, this approach will require γ/ϵ measurements; $0.5\gamma/\epsilon$ on average *iff* the scan is adaptively implemented and will cease after locating the target. Not only does this approach again require a far larger number of measurements for any appreciable $1/\epsilon$, but the inefficiency is compounded by the dwell parameter, γ, which must be at least 1. Once more, we dismiss this strategy and ignore it henceforth.

B. Analysis

To estimate the average optimal number of queries needed to locate a target with precision ϵ for specific α_0, we consider the amount of mutual information – from Eq. 8 – delivered by a hypothetical optimal first measurement as dictated by Eq. 9. We approximate all consequent measurements with this value. Achieving the desired precision corresponds to acquiring $\log_2(1/\epsilon)$ bits of information, and thus requires an estimated $\lceil [\log_2(1/\epsilon) \text{ bits}] \;/\; [I(X:R)|_{\alpha_0,v_0} \text{ bits/query}] \rceil$ queries.

We simulated one million random emitter positions, using $\alpha_0 = 0.99$, and subjected each to bi-, tri-, and tetra-sectioning with verification as described above, to an arbitrarily selected precision of $\epsilon = 10^{-10}$. (This high resolution displays the algorithmic speedup well; microscopy generally deals with $\epsilon > 10^{-6}$, or the approximate ratio of a confocal spot diameter to the length of a 96-well plate.) The measurement regions were curtailed only after positive detection, otherwise cycling through the 2, 3, or 4 sections available. For $\alpha_0 = 0.99$, this dictates an estimated ≈ 6240 "optimal" queries.

Figure 4a shows a histogram of the Monte Carlo results: the mode of each stratagem is apparent, with Mo(trisectioning) < Mo(tetrasectioning) < Mo(bisectioning). The trisectioning mode is also smaller than the estimated optimal average number of measurements; the semi-infinite nature of the data space allows for an average value pulled right of the mode.

Fig. 4b is the cumulative density function for each approach, from which the median is extractable where each curve crosses the horizontal dotted line. Again, the same ordering is evident, with Md(trisectioning) falling just below the estimated optimal average number.

The distribution means are displayed in the first row of Table II, and are consistent with the other measures of central tendency, except that the trisectioning mean is now slightly higher than the estimated optimal average. In addition, the mean number of queries required was evaluated for several different error rates, and form the remainder of Table II. Similar estimates for the optimal



FIG. 4. Results of 1,000,000 Monte Carlo trials with $\alpha_0 = 0.99$ for each sectioning strategy: a) Histograms of search heuristic results indicating the mode of each strategy, and estimated optimal average result, and b) cumulative distributions of same, indicating median values. Note: the trisectioning trace is to the left of both bi- and tetra-sectioning for almost the entire number of trials. Also note the estimated optimal average (dotted black line), similar but not equal to the trisectioning median (intersections with dashed black line).

α_0	$\overline{\text{Bi}-}$ sectioning	$\overline{\text{Tri}-}$ sectioning	$\overline{\text{Tetra}-}$ sectioning	Est. optimal
0.99	6783.13	6275.92	6771.67	6240
0.5	119.00	105.02	110.49	104
0.3	80.15	69.00	71.64	66
0.1	58.55	49.01	50.06	44
1/18	54.99	45.71	46.49	40
1/35	53.00	43.85	44.60	37
1/36	52.94	43.80	44.44	37
0.01	51.69	42.64	43.18	35
0.001	51.07	42.06	42.57	34
0	51.00	42.00	42.50	34

TABLE II. Average number of measurements (for 10^6 trials) to locate an emitter to one of 10^{10} bins using various heuristic search strategies and an estimate of the optimal average value obtained from Eqs. 8 and 9 (shown in Fig. 4g).

behaviour based on $I(X:R)|_{\alpha_0,w}$ are also provided.

The requirement of absolute knowledge (zero PDF outside the final location), by positive verification of presence through signal capture, inflicts a penalty on the sectioning strategies. As mentioned above, 33.2 bits of information are required: at zero error rate, this dictates 34 measurements in a perfect scheme. The final row of Table II shows that none of the sectioning strategies performs particularly well compared to this mark, with bisectioning using on average 50% more queries than required. In contrast, tri- and tetra-sectioning only require 24% more queries than are optimal. Neither uses the extra (positive) information which can be derived from null results, which faithfully indicate that the target is not present. The ignorance and disuse of the full information available by the insistence on positive verification translates as an extra cost in the number of measurements required.

It is instructive to consider the lower (non-trivial) limit of error rates, where the most likely outcome is one error. Assuming the 34 necessary plus one erroneous measurements, one error is most likely for $1/36 \leq \alpha_0 \leq 1/18$, with the expected value of one error for $\alpha_0 = 1/35$. Rivest *et al.*[31] proved that finding a target in k discrete bins, when up to E responses to comparison questions may be erroneous *iff* the truth is of one specified type (*e.g.*, less than), requires $Q \geq \lceil \log_2(k) + E\log_2\log_2(k) + O[E\log_2(E)] \rceil$ comparison questions. For our example case, where $E = 1$ and $k = 10^{10}$, $E\log_2(E) = 0$, requiring $Q \geq \lceil \sim 38.2 \rceil = 39$ queries. From Table II, the trisectioning heuristic performs on average within 11% of the Rivest *et al.* bound within these limits, and outperforms the bi- and tetra-sectioning approaches.

Not only does bisectioning fail to be optimal (even for zero error), trisectioning outperforms it at every error rate as well. From Table II we can determine that the penalty for using bi- instead of tri-sectioning is 8–21%, depending on the photon loss rate – and worst for low loss rate (where the insistence on positive verification is most deleterious). There is therefore an immediate, quantifiable benefit to preferring the trisectioning strategy over bisectioning. Tetrasectioning has a similar, albeit smaller, penalty, and is nearly as efficient as trisectioning for low error rates.

Although for low photon loss, the trisectioning heuristic requires more measurements than the estimated optimal information use, its performance improves markedly as losses increase. For typical confocal microscope conditions ($\alpha_0 \approx 0.99$), trisectioning requires on average only 1% more measurements, and beats bisectioning by 10%.

Returning to the original context of confocal/multiphoton microscopy, one major point of difference is that here, we explicitly recognise that once a subdomain is searched and a null result obtained, the target is more likely elsewhere in the full domain. In contrast, conventional approaches dwell on each pixel, effectively performing a number of measurements (as defined by our approach) several orders of magnitude larger than the one performed here before moving the PSF. Such processes are information inefficient.

The second, and more impactful, difference is that conventional microscopy *always* searches the same amount of area per query, whereas the sectioning approaches resize the PSF after verification. This is the origin of the change from linear to logarithmic behaviour – if the local intensity of the probe beam within the PSF can be maintained for diffuse measurements.

V. CONCLUSIONS

In summary, the cost of verification is most apparent at low photon loss rates. For zero loss, half of the available information is being ignored by the proposed sectioning strategies, and they suffer a consequent loss of efficiency compared to the optimal true binary search. However, the insistence on verification comes into its own when, as in confocal experiments, the photon loss rate is high ($\approx$ 99%). The trisectioning heuristic is more efficient than bi- or tetra-sectioning for problems involving many random half-lies. The introduction of half-lies, or asymmetric noise, negates the speedup inherent to true binary search under perfect conditions. Further, although trisectioning with verification is sub-optimal, it appears near-optimal according to our estimator.

In practical terms, since photon-counting microscopes have already been developed, the trisectioning scheme discussed here offers the chance for greatly accelerated target searches over current confocal rastering techniques. This approach could be particularly useful for locating short-lived species if the microscope point-spread function can be modified quickly enough, via both changing the spot size as well as shifting the beam centre, thereby changing the search domain rapidly between measurements. However, before such a task is undertaken, it would be beneficial to reconsider this problem with explicit Gaussian roll-offs and/or general shape to the PSF, and also to fully characterise the intensity changes required by the varying PSF widths. Finally, before such an approach is applied to biological systems, attempts should be made to include penalty functions characterising photon exposure and/or damage, as well as accounting for practical considerations such as time to modify or shift the PSF, to study how the dynamics of an optimal biological search differ from those presented here. Information may not be the sole metric of interest to be optimised; a full cost-benefit analysis accounting for these issues may eschew the information benefit of shifting position more often.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors thank Nicolas Menicucci, Brant Gibson, Adrian Dyer, Jair Garcia, and Chris Xu for insightful discussions, and acknowledge the support of the Australian Research Council (project numbers CE140100003 and FT160100357).

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

DWD and ADG conceived of, planned, carried out, and analysed the study. DWD and ADG wrote the manuscript.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

The authors declare no competing financial interest.

* daniel.drumm@rmit.edu.au

[1] J. B. Pawley, *Handbook of Biological Confocal Microscopy*, Springer, 2006.

[2] N. G. Horton, K. Wang, D. Kobat, C. G. Clark, F. W. Wise, C. B. Schaffer, and C. Xu, "*In vivo* three-photon microscopy of subcortical structures within an intact mouse brain", *Nature Photonics*, **7**:205, 2013.

[3] M. Chalfie, Y. Tu, G. Euskirchen, W. W. Ward, and D. C. Prasher, "Green Fluorescent Protein as a Marker for Gene Expression", *Science* **263**:802, 1994.

[4] P. Reineck and B. C. Gibson, "Near-Infrared Fluorescent Nanomaterials for Bioimaging and Sensing", *Advanced Optical Materials*, 2016.

[5] P. Reineck, A. Francis, A. Orth, D. W. M. Lau, R. D. V. Nixon-Luke, I. Das Rastogi, W. A. W. Razali, N. M. Cordina, L. M. Parker, V. K. A. Sreenivasan, L. J. Brown, and B. C. Gibson, "Brightness and Photostability of Emerging Red and Near-IR Fluorescent Nanomaterials for Bioimaging", *Advanced Optical Materials* **4**(10):1549, 2016.

[6] I. E. Kochevar, "Phototoxicity Mechanisms: Chlorpromazine Photosensitized Damage to DNA and Cell Membranes", *The Journal of Investigative Dermatology*, **76**:59, 1981.

[7] L. Song, E. J. Hennink, I. T. Young, and H. J. Tanke, "Photobleaching Kinetics of Fluorescein in Quantitative Fluorescence Microscopy", *Biophysical Journal*, **68**:2588, 1995.

[8] N. C. Shaner, M. Z. Lin, M. R. McKeown, P. A. Steinbach, K. L. Hazelwood, M. W. Davidson, and R. Y. Tsien, "Improving the photostability of bright monomeric orange and red fluorescent proteins", *Nature Methods*, **5**(6):545, 2008.

[9] R. Nowak, "Generalized binary search", *Communication, Control, and Computing, 2008 46th Annual Allerton Conference on.*, IEEE, 2008.

[10] R. Nowak, "Noisy generalized binary search", in *Advances in neural information processing systems*, p1366, Curran Associates, Inc., 2009.

[11] M. R. Garey and R. L. Graham, "Performance Bounds on the Splitting Algorithm for Binary Testing", *Acta Informatica*, **3**:347, 1974.

[12] A. Rényi, "On a problem of information theory", *MTA Mat. Kut. Int. Kozl.* **6B**:505, 1961.

[13] S. M. Ulam, *Adventures of a Mathematician*, p. 281, *Scribner*, New York, 1976.

[14] A. Pelc, "Searching games with errors – fifty years of coping with liars", *Theoretical Computer Science*, **270**:71, 2002.

[15] R. Ellis and C. Yan, "Ulam's pathological liar game with one half-lie", *Int. J. Math. Math. Sci.*, **2004**(09):1523, 2004.

[16] R. B. Ellis, V. Ponomarenko, and C. H. Yan, "The Rényi-Ulam pathological liar game with a fixed number of lies", *J. Comb. Th. A*, **112**:328, 2005.

[17] R. B. Ellis, V. Ponomarenko, and C. H. Yan, "How to play the one-lie Rényi-Ulam game", *Disc. Math.*, **308**:5805, 2008.

[18] F. Cicalese, *Fault-Tolerant Search Algorithms: Reliable Computation with Unreliable Information*, Springer-Verlag, 2013.

[19] A. C. Yao and F. F. Yao, "On fault-tolerant networks for sorting", *SIAM J. Comput.*, **14**:120, 1985.

[20] B. Ravikumar, K. Ganesan, and K. B. Lakshmanan, "On Selecting the Largest Element In Spite of Erroneous Information", *Annual Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1987.

[21] K. B. Lakshmanan, B. Ravikumar, and K. Ganesan, "Coping with erroneous information while sorting", *IEEE Trans. Comput.*, **40**:1081, 1991.

[22] U. Feige, D. Peleg, P. Raghavan, and E. Upfal, "Computing with noisy information", *SIAM J. Comput.*, *23*:1001, 1994.

[23] A. De Bonis, L. Gargano, and U. Vaccaro, "Group testing with unreliable tests", *Inform. Sci.*, **96**:1, 1997.

[24] H. Q. Ngo and D. Z. Du, "A Survey on Combinatorial Group Testing Algorithms with Applications to DNA Library Screening", in *Discrete Mathematical Problems with Medical Applications: DIMACS Workshop*, **55**:171, Am. Math. Soc., 2000.

[25] F. Cicalese and D. Mundici, "Learning and the Art of Fault-Tolerant Guesswork", in *Adaptivity and Learning: An Interdisciplinary Debate'*, Eds. R. Kühn, R. Menzel, W. Menzel, U. Ratsch, M. M. Richter, and I.-O. Stamatescu, Springer-Verlag, 2003.

[26] S. Mancini and L. Maccone, "Using Quantum Mechanics to Cope with Liars", *Int. J. Quant. Inf.*, **3**(4):729, 2005.

[27] R. M. Karp and R. Kleinberg, "Noisy binary search and its applications", in *Proc. 18*th *ACM-SIAM symposium on discrete algorithms*, Soc. Ind. and Appl. Math., 2007.

[28] E. A. Corsi and F. Montagna, "The Rényi–Ulam games and many-valued logics", *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, **301**:37, 2016.

[29] B. Jedynak, P. I. Frazier, and R. Sznitman, "Twenty questions with noise: Bayes optimal policies for entropy loss", *J. Appl. Prob.*, **49**(1):114, 2011.

[30] A. Pelc, "Searching with known error probability", *Th. Comp. Sci.*, **63**:185, 1989.

[31] R. L. Rivest, A. R. Meyer, D. J. Kleitman, and K. Winklmann, "Coping with Errors in Binary Search Procedures", *J. Comp. Sys. Sci.*, **20**:396, 1980.

[32] B. Ravikumar and K. B. Lakshmanan. "Coping with known patterns of lies in a search game", *Theoretical Computer Science* **33**(1):85, 1984.

[33] A. Pelc, "Solution of Ulam's Problem on Searching with a Lie", *Journal of Computational Theory Series A*, **44**:129, 1987.

[34] S. Muthukrishnan, "On optimal strategies for searching in the presence of errors", in *Proceedings of the Fifth ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms*, p680, 1994.

[35] A. Dhagat, P. Gács, and P. Winkler, "On playing "twenty questions" with a liar", in *Proc. 3*rd *ACM-SIAM symposium on discrete algorithms*, Soc. Ind. Appl. Math., 1992.

[36] F. Cicalese and D. Mundici, "Optimal Coding with One Asymmetric Error: Below the Sphere Packing Bound", in *Computing and Combinatorics: Proc. 6*th *Int. Comp. Comb. Conf.*, Eds. D.-Z. Du, P. Eades, V. Estivill-Castro, X. Lin, and A. Sharma, Springer-Verlag, 2000.

[37] F. Cicalese and C. Deppe, "Quasi-Perfect Minimally Adaptive q-ary Search with Unreliable Tests", in *Proceedings of the 14th International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation*, Springer-Verlag, 2003.

[38] F. Cicalese, C. Deppe, and D. Mundici, "Q-Ary Ulam-Rényi Game with Weighted Constrained Lies", in *Proceedings of the 10th International Computing and Combinatorics Conference*, Springer-Verlag Berlin, 2004.

[39] F. Cicalese and C. Deppe, "Perfect minimally adaptive q-ary search with unreliable tests", *Journal of Statstical Planning and Inference* **137**:162, 2007.

[40] S. M. Xing, W. A. Liu, and K. Meng, "Rényi-Berlekamp-Ulam searching game with bi-interval queries and two lies", *Discrete Applied Mathematics* **202**:8, 2016.

[41] W. W. Peterson, T. G. Birdsall, and W. C. Fox, "The Theory of Signal [*sic*] Dectectability", *Transactions of the IRE professional group on information theory*, **4**(4):171, 1954

[42] D. M. Green and J. A. Swets, *Signal detection theory and psychophysics*, *Wiley*, New York, 1966.

[43] J. Spencer and P. Winkler, "Three thresholds for a liar", *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing* **1**:81, 1992.

[44] I. N. Soskov, "Definability via Enumerations", *J. Symb. Logic*, **54**(2):428, 1989.

[45] D. P. Dobkin and D. L. Souvaine, "Detecting the intersection of convex objects in the plane", *Computer aided geometric design*, **8**(3):181, 1991.

[46] K. M. Salehin and R. Rojas-Cessa, "Combined methodology for measurement of available bandwidth and link capacity in wired packet networks" *IET communications*, **4**(2):240, 2010.

[47] J. L. Bentley and R. Sedgewick, "Fast Algorithms for Sorting and Searching Strings", *SODA*, **97**:360, 1997.